



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/804,516

03/19/2004

Arun Kwangil Iyengar

YOR920040025US1

7509

7590 05/30/2008
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

PHUNG, LUAT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,516	Applicant(s) IYENGAR ET AL.	
	Examiner LUAT PHUNG	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
2. Applicants' arguments filed on Cinco de Mayo, 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
3. Regarding claims 2-4, applicants argue that:

Applicants again assert that, with regard to claims 2-4, no where does Colby teach or suggest withholding the request from submission to the at least one server when the request originated from a client assigned to a first QoS class to allow a request that originated from a client assigned to a second QoS class to meet a response target associated therewith (as recited in claim 2), determining a throughput of the at least one server; and reducing a request withhold rate to increase throughput of the at least one server (as recited in claim 3), and monitoring a throughput of the at least one server; and varying a request withhold rate to balance the throughput and request response times (as recited in claim 4). In the final Office Action, the Examiner does not counter this argument, but rather simply recites the original ground of rejection.

Examiner disagrees because:

As stated in the rejection of claims 2-4, Colby discloses:

determining a throughput of the at least one server (**col. 6, line 46 to last line**);

and

monitoring a throughput of the at least one server (**col. 6, line 46 to last line**).

Bender from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a server which employs a pre-emptive setting not continuously processing a request, but scheduling them according to an earliest deadline first methodology, by alternately processing the request with the earliest deadline first, followed by that with the next earliest deadline, and so on (**col. 4, lines 52-58; col. 5, lines 27-35**).

Bender from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a server which employs a pre-emptive setting of scheduling requests according to an earliest deadline first methodology (**col. 4, lines 52-58; col. 5, lines 27-35**), calculating processing time and dead line for each request (**Fig. 2, element 102**), and continue adjusting estimated processing time (**Fig. 2, element 112**).

4. Regarding claim 8, applicants argue that:

Regarding the claims 8 and 10-12 which depend from independent claim 1, Applicants assert that such claims are patentable not only due to their respective dependence on claim 1, but also because such claims recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Also, Veres and Menditto fail to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Colby.

Examiner disagrees because:

As stated in the rejection of claim 8, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses further comprising the step of estimating the response time associated with the at least one server based on one or more requests sent to the at least one server within a given time period. (**col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32**)

In an alternative rejection, Veres from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses further comprising the step of estimating the response time (**col. 13, lines 46-47**) associated with the at least one server or applications based on one or more requests sent to the at least one server or applications within a given time period (**time window of measurement as shown in Fig. 2; col. 13, lines 36-47**).

5. Regarding claims 10-12, applicants argue that:

In the final Office Action, the Examiner seems to ignore various limitations recited in claim 10 (determining dispatch times for requests from a difference between at least one predicted response time of the at least one server and the target response time corresponding to the QoS class of the request; and sending requests to the at least one server based on dispatch times) and merely states that Veres discloses estimating response time, and Menditto discloses a content gateway. There is no explanation as to where in Colby, Veres, or Menditto, that the subject limitations are found. Also, while the Examiner takes Official Notice about acceptable response times, which Applicants challenge, there is no where to be found an explanation as to how all of these assertions add up to disclosing the subject limitations of the claim. The same deficiency exists in the rejection of claim 11 and 12. That is, the final Office Action seems to ignore large parts of the claim language, particularly the claim parts having to do with the QoS classes assigned to the clients.

Examiner disagrees because:

The last office action does not “merely state[s] that Veres discloses estimating response time, and Menditto discloses a content gateway.” (emphases added)

In fact, it states the following:

“Veres from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses further comprising the step of estimating the response time (col. 13, lines 46-47) associated with the at least one server or applications based on one or more requests sent to the at least one server or applications within a given time period (time window of measurement as shown in Fig. 2; col. 13, lines 36-47).

Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a content gateway selecting a server that can deliver with an acceptable response time (col. 2, lines 64-66).” (emphasis added)

It is suggested that applicants peruse the office action in its entirety.

Regarding claim 10, as stated in its rejection in the instant office action, Colby discloses using response time as a metric to select a server to meet QoS requirements **(col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 59; claim 32)**. Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a content gateway making routing decisions based on the request, selecting a server satisfying the request and depending on various factors such as server load, and forwarding the request to the selected server **(col. 3, lines 11-61)**.

In other words, specifically Colby, Kokot and Menditto read on the claim as follows: determining dispatch times for requests (Menditto, making routing decisions) from a difference between at least one predicted response time of the at least one server (Colby, response time metric in server database) and the target response time corresponding to the QoS class of the request (Colby and Kokot, QoS class; Menditto and Colby, selecting server in view of response time); and sending requests to the at

least one server based on dispatch times (Menditto and Colby, forward request to server).

Regarding claim 11, as stated in its rejection, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses:

wherein a plurality of applications are running on the at least one server and requests are routed to applications (**col. 1, line 55 to col. 2, line 4**), further comprising the steps of:

estimating response times of applications based on one or more requests sent to the applications within a time period. (**col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32**)

Colby discloses using response time as a metric to select a server to meet QoS requirements (**col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 59; claim 32**). Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses selecting an optimal server based on a set of rules, defining as producing the quickest response time to the request. (**col. 6, lines 16-40**)

Regarding claim 12, as stated in its rejection, Colby discloses sending requests to applications to a server based on response time (**col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32**) Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a content gateway updating policies regarding processing of requests based on service level agreements (**col. 7, lines 1-52**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a

whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 1, 5-9 and 14-17 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al (US 6,449,647) in view of Kokot, et al (US 2004/0258003).

Regarding claim 1, Colby discloses an article of manufacture for processing a request to at least one server, comprising a computer readable medium containing one or more programs (**abstract; Fig. 23; col. 19, lines 47-65**) which when executed implement the steps of:

receiving a request (**col. 2, lines 55-56**); and

scheduling submission of the request to the at least one server (**col. 2, lines 58-59**) based on: (i) a quality-of-service (QoS) class (**col. 9, lines 36-39**); (ii) a response target associated with the QoS class (**col. 9, lines 25-32; col. 21, lines 50-51**); and (iii) an estimated response time associated with the at least one server (**col. 22, lines 10-11**).

Colby discloses all of the subject matter except (i) a quality-of-service (QoS) class assigned to a client from which the request originated. Kokot from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a QoS class assigned to a subscriber from which the packet flow originated (**para. 116**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Colby's method of processing a request based on QoS flow classes with Kokot's QoS subscriber classes by assigning the QoS classes to the clients and scheduling the request based on these QoS classes. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure proper level of quality for the service request.

Regarding claim 5, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses further comprising the step of assigning the response target to the QoS class (**Table 1; col. 9, lines 25-39; col. 22, lines 10-11**).

Regarding claim 6, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses wherein the step of assigning the response target to the QoS class further comprises the step of assigning a response time target to the QoS class. (**Table 1; col. 9, lines 25-39; col. 22, lines 10-11**)

Regarding claim 7, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses wherein the step of assigning the response target to the QoS class further comprises the step of assigning a response percentile target to the QoS class. **(col. 16, lines 56-61 and 65-66)**

Regarding claim 8, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses further comprising the step of estimating the response time associated with the at least one server based on one or more requests sent to the at least one server within a given time period. **(col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32)**

Regarding claim 9, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses QoS classes based on delay, whereas lower quality class is assigned higher delay **(QoS class 3 with delay of 500 ms per Table 1)** than higher quality class **(QoS class 1 with delay of <250 ms per Table 1)**. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art that delay is proportional to response time in terms of processing a request by a server.

Regarding claim 14, Colby further discloses an apparatus for processing a request to at least one server, comprising:

a memory **(RAM per Fig. 23, element 110)**; and

at least one processor coupled to the memory **(Fig. 23, element 1080)** and operative to perform the method of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 15, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses wherein the memory and the at least one processor form a scheduler **(Fig. 1b, element 110)** that is external to the at least one server **(Fig. 1b, elements 100)**.

Regarding claim 16, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses the apparatus of claim 15, wherein the scheduler is a front-end scheduler and the at least one server is a back-end server (**Fig. 1b, elements 110 and 100; col. 16, lines 28-29**).

10. Claims 2-4, 18-20 and 25 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al in view of Kokot, et al, and further in view of Bender, et al (US 6,112,221).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Colby and Kokot discloses all of the subject matter as disclosed previously in this office action except for the following:

further comprising the step of withholding the request from submission to the at least one server when the request originated from a client assigned to a first QoS class to allow a request that originated from a client assigned to a second QoS class to meet a response target associated therewith.

Bender from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a server which employs a pre-emptive setting not continuously processing a request, but scheduling them according to an earliest deadline first methodology, by alternately processing the request with the earliest deadline first, followed by that with the next earliest deadline, and so on (**col. 4, lines 52-58; col. 5, lines 27-35**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the pre-emptive scheduling method of Bender by pre-empting the request having a lower QoS class with the request having a

higher QoS class. The motivation for using pre-emptive procedure would have been to prioritize requests according to response target.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the combination of Colby, Kokot and Bender discloses substantially all of the subject matter as disclosed previously in this office action. Colby further discloses:

determining a throughput of the at least one server (**col. 6, line 46 to last line**), as recited in claim 3; and

monitoring a throughput of the at least one server (**col. 6, line 46 to last line**), as recited in claim 4.

Colby and Kokot do not explicitly disclose:

reducing a request withhold rate to increase throughput of the at least one server, as recited in claim 3;

varying a request withhold rate to balance the throughput and request response times, as recited in claim 4.

Bender from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a server which employs a pre-emptive setting of scheduling requests according to an earliest deadline first methodology (**col. 4, lines 52-58; col. 5, lines 27-35**), calculating processing time and dead line for each request (**Fig. 2, element 102**), and continue adjusting estimated processing time (**Fig. 2, element 112**).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the pre-emptive scheduling method of Bender by pre-empting the request having a

lower QoS class with the request having a higher QoS class, monitoring the throughput of the servers, and adjusting the pre-emption rate so that the request can be processed within the target response time. The motivation for using pre-emptive procedure would have been to prioritize requests according to response target.

Regarding claims 18 and 25, Colby discloses assigning a response target to at least one QoS class (**Table 1; col. 9, lines 25-39; col. 22, lines 10-11**); and estimating at least one response time of the at least one server based on one or more requests sent to the server within a given time period (**col. 2, lines 54-64; col. 6, lines 46 to last line; claim 32**)

Colby does not explicitly disclose assigning at least one client to a quality-of-service (QoS) class from among at least two QoS classes. Kokot from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses assigning at least one client to a quality-of-service (QoS) class from among at least two QoS classes (**para. 116**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Colby's method of processing a request with Kokot's QoS subscriber classes by assigning the QoS classes to the clients. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure proper level of quality for the service request.

The combination of Colby and Kokot discloses all of the subject matter except:
withholding requests associated with a first one of the at least two QoS classes to allow requests associated with a second one of the at least two QoS classes to meet its response target based on the at least one estimated response time.

Bender from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a server which employs a pre-emptive setting not continuously processing a request, but scheduling them according to an earliest deadline first methodology, by alternately processing the request with the earliest deadline first, followed by that with the next earliest deadline, and so on (**col. 4, lines 52-58; col. 5, lines 27-35**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the pre-emptive scheduling method of Bender by pre-empting the request having a lower QoS class with the request having a higher QoS class. The motivation for using pre-emptive procedure would have been to prioritize requests according to response target.

Claims 19 and 20 are substantial duplicates of claims 3 and 4, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 3 and 4, respectively.

11. Claim 8 is rejected, in an alternative, under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al in view of Kokot, et al, and further in view of Veres, et al (US 6,807,156).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Colby and Kokot discloses all of the subject matter as previously recited in this office action. Further, Veres from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses further comprising the step of estimating the response time (**col. 13, lines 46-47**) associated with the at least one server or applications based on one or more requests sent to the at least one server or

applications within a given time period (**time window of measurement as shown in Fig. 2; col. 13, lines 36-47**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the response time estimating method of Veres by periodically sending requests to the applications and servers to estimate the response time. The motivation for such a combination would have been to ensure service level agreement based on response time is met.

12. Claims 10-12 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al in view of Kokot, et al, and further in view of Menditto, et al (US 6,981,029).

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Colby and Kokot discloses all of the subject matter as disclosed previously in this office action except for the following:

determining dispatch times for requests from a difference between at least one predicted response time of the at least one server and the target response time corresponding to the QoS class of the request; and

sending requests to the at least one server based on dispatch times.

However Colby discloses using response time as a metric to select a server to meet QoS requirements (**col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 59; claim 32**). Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a content gateway making routing decisions based on the request, selecting a server satisfying the request and depending on various factors such as server load, and forwarding the request to the selected server (**col. 3, lines 11-61**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the QoS enforcement approach by Menditto by selecting a server that can timely process the request. The motivation for such a combination would have been to ensure service level agreement based on response time is met.

Regarding claim 11, Colby in view of Kokot further discloses:

wherein a plurality of applications are running on the at least one server and requests are routed to applications (**col. 1, line 55 to col. 2, line 4**), further comprising the steps of:

estimating response times of applications based on one or more requests sent to the applications within a time period. (**col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32**)

The combination of Colby and Kokot does not explicitly disclose:

sending a request to an application whose estimated response time is not greater than a target response time corresponding to the QoS class of the request.

However Colby discloses using response time as a metric to select a server to meet QoS requirements (**col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 59; claim 32**). Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses selecting an optimal server based on a set of rules, defining as producing the quickest response time to the request. (**col. 6, lines 16-40**) Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the QoS enforcement approach by Menditto by selecting a server that can timely process the request. The motivation for such a combination would have been to ensure service level agreement based on response time is met.

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Colby and Kokot discloses all of the subject matter as recited above except:

further comprising the step of varying a number of requests sent to applications so that estimated response times of applications are not greater than target response times of QoS classes corresponding to requests sent to the applications.

However Colby discloses sending requests to applications to a server based on response time (**col. 6, line 46 to last line; claim 32**) Menditto from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses a content gateway updating policies regarding processing of requests based on service level agreements (**col. 7, lines 1-52**). Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the request processing method of Colby and Kokot with the QoS enforcement approach by Menditto by selecting a server that can timely process the request. The motivation for such a combination would have been to ensure service level agreement based on response time is met.

13. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al in view of Kokot, et al, and Menditto, et al, and further in view of Lu, et al (US 6,772,211).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Colby, Kokot and Menditto discloses all of the subject matter as disclosed previously in this office action except wherein the at least one server comprises a plurality of servers and each application runs on a different one of the plurality of servers.

Lu from the same or similar fields of endeavor discloses methods to switch client packets to one server among a group of servers (**col. 4, lines 50-53**) and applications have their own dedicated servers (**col. 5, lines 24-26**).

Thus it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the packet processing method of Colby, Kokot and Menditto with the servers and applications of Lu by implementing the method and each application on a separate server. The motivation for such a combination would have been to modularize the features for scalability and performance.

14. Claims 21-23 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al and Kokot, et al in view of Bender, et al and Menditto et al.

Claims 21-23 are substantial duplicates of claims 10-12, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 10-12, respectively.

15. Claim 24 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, et al, and Kokot, et al in view of Bender, et al and Menditto et al in further view of Lu, et al.

Claim 24 is a substantial duplicate of claims 13 and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 13.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see form 892).

17. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and, also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the Claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2616

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luat Phung whose telephone number is 571-270-3126. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM, F 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/Huy D. Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616